

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **July 1, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-21. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Evans et al (USPub 2002/0129337 A1, hereinafter “Evans”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being anticipated by Evans. Applicant respectfully points out that Evans teaches debugging an **application program** that is executing on a platform-independent (Java) virtual machine (see Evans, Abstract and paragraph [0040]).

In contrast, the present invention recovers and displays the state of variables within a platform-independent virtual machine so that an analyst can determine if **the platform-independent virtual machine is operating correctly** and, if not, determine a possible cause for the incorrect operation (see paragraphs [0030] and [0031] of the instant application).

Determining if the platform-independent virtual machine is operating correctly is different than debugging an application program, which runs on the platform-independent virtual machine. During debugging of an application program, it is assumed that the platform-independent virtual machine is operating correctly. Determining if the platform-independent virtual machine is operating correctly is more difficult (particularly on systems with limited memory) because the platform-independent virtual machine is typically operating on a device with few, if any, debugging programs to aid in porting the platform-independent virtual machine (see paragraph [0004] of the instant application).

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention displays the state of variables within a platform-independent virtual machine so that an analyst can determine if the platform-independent virtual machine is operating correctly and, if not, determine a


possible cause for the incorrect operation. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0030] and [0031] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 16-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: July 14, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665